

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Decision on Appeal dated September 20, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

The Board has reversed the rejection of claims 1-20 in this appeal. However, the Board has applied new grounds of rejection. In particular, claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Saotome (U.S.P. 5,115,132).

Applicant hereinabove amends the claims and submits the comments as follows in traversal of the new grounds of rejection.

With regard to the Section 112, second paragraph rejection, the Board indicates that it is not clear how the erasing light can be disposed on one side of the transparent substrate if the erasing light source is the transparent substrate. Decision on appeal at pages 6-7. The Board also indicates that it is unclear how the requirements of the base claims can be consistent with claims 6 and 14. Applicant directs attention to Fig. 1, for example, where the erasing light source 40 is disposed on one side of the transparent layer 2A and the phosphor layer 2B is disposed on the opposite side of the transparent layer. With regard to the relation of claim 6 and 14 with claims 3 and 11, respectively, Applicant directs attention to Fig. 6, which shows the transparent layer with light sources disposed at either end of a transparent layer 2A. The illustrative figures are consistent with the claim recitations such that claims 6 and 14 meet all requirements of Section 112.

AMENDMENT  
Appln. No.: 09/943,355

Attorney Docket No.: Q66024

With regard to the new prior art rejection of claims 1, 9 and 19-20, Applicant amends independent claims 1 and 9 to describe that the image read out is performed while the phosphor sheet is stationary. In Saotome, the recording sheet is transferred between cases 425 and 426 to provide the image read out. In this regard, the disclosure in Saotome will require a large space for the reading device. By contrast, the structure of claims 1 and 9 provide a more compact structure.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Perng Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 21, 2005